

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-11, and 15-20 are pending in this application, with claims 1, 15, and 19 being independent. By this amendment, claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 9, 15-17, and 19 are amended.

Claims 1, 2, 7-10, and 15-19 stand rejected as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,629,136 (Naidoo). Claim 4 stands rejected as obvious over Naidoo in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,477,504 (Hamlin). Claims 5 and 6 stand rejected as obvious over Naidoo in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,895,387 (Roberts). Claims 11 and 20 stand rejected as obvious over Naidoo in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,236,975 (Boe). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections because these references, either singly or in combination, do not provide for the subject matter of amended independent claims 1, 15, and 19.

Independent claims 1, 15, and 19 recite, in part, “generat[ing] a message that contains information describing conditions in [a] target geographic location,” “identify[ing] . . . online users that are located in the target geographic location and who employ at least one of [a] target type of access device or [a] target type of software,” and “sending the message to the identified . . . online users.” In one implementation, for example, a message may be generated that contains a weather forecast for Washington, D.C. The online users that are associated with Washington, D.C. (e.g., are located in Washington, D.C.) and who employ a particular type of access device or a particular type of software are identified, and the message with the weather forecast for Washington, D.C. is sent to the identified users.

As recognized in the previous office action, Naidoo does not describe or suggest that “targeting rules [can] additionally designate a particular type of access device and software employed by the user.” Office Action, Page 6, Paragraph 16 (rejecting claims 5 and 6). Accordingly, Applicant submits that Naidoo does not anticipate amended independent claims 1, 15, and 19, at least because these claims recite that “the targeting rules [designate] at least a target geographic location and at least one of a target type of access device or a target type of software.”

Dependent claims 5 and 6 include similar features, and the Office Action rejects dependent claims 5 and 6 as being obvious over the combination of Naidoo and Roberts. In making such a rejection, the Office Action asserts that it would have been obvious to combine Naidoo and Roberts to obtain a system that targets advertisements to users based on the users’

geographic locations and type of access device or software. According to the Office Action, the skilled artisan would have been motivated to do so because "this would reduce business expenditures by allowing companies to send advertisements to targeted customers." Office Action, Page 7, Paragraph 16. However, even assuming that this is a proper combination of Naidoo and Roberts, such a combination does not provide for the subject matter of amended independent claims 1, 15, and 19.

Independent claims 1, 15, and 19 recite "generat[ing] a message that contains information describing conditions in at least a portion of the target geographic location." Naidoo and Roberts do not describe or suggest that their advertisements contain information describing conditions in at least a portion of a target geographic location. Accordingly, even if the combination of Naidoo and Roberts asserted by the Office Action is proper, it does not provide for all of the features of independent claims 1, 15, and 19. Further, Applicant submits that there is no motivation to combine Naidoo and Roberts in a manner that provides for all of the features of these claims.

Moreover, Applicant submits that neither Hamlin or Boe, either singly or in combination, remedies this deficiency of Naidoo and Roberts.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 15, and 19 are patentable over Naidoo, Hamlin, Roberts, and Boe, either singly or in combination. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of independent claims 1, 15, and 19 and the claims that depend from them.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Applicant : Barry Appelman et al.
Serial No. : 09/842,024
Filed : April 26, 2001
Page : 11 of 11

Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-128001 / Personalization
14

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10/25/05



Kevin E. Greene
Reg. No. 46,031

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40307513.doc